

Appl. No. 10/550,850

**Remarks/Arguments**

This application has been carefully considered in light of the Non-Final Office Action mailed April 19, 2006. As a result, claims 1-4 have been amended and new claims 5-8 added. Responsive to the Office Action, the following is submitted.

Drawings

The Examiner required corrected drawings in response to the Office Action. Accordingly, Replacement Sheets of drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R 1.121(d) are submitted.

The Specification

An amended Abstract of the Disclosure is presented with this response.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.A. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-4 have been rejected as being indefinite. In this respect, the claims have been amended to overcome this grounds

Appl. No. 10/550,850

for rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.A. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 as being directly anticipated by US Patent 6,083,021 to Lau. This reference has been considered but is not believed to teach the inventive concept of the present application as set forth in the claims. The structure of the fluorescent light of Lau is the same as the prior art discussed in the "Description of Related Art" section of the present application, see page 1, lines 4-14 of the present application. It is the shortcomings of such prior art structures that the structure of the fluorescent lights of the present invention overcome.

More specifically, in Lau, the ballast 18 and the lamp support housing 12 are both mounted in the central area of the plane of the outer fluorescent tube and thus the light can not be inserted onto a center-pole configured lamp fixture, in a radial direction, as is possible with the present invention wherein a center passage is created that permits laterally extending electrical contacts, such as shown at "G" in Fig. 2 of the drawings of the present application, to be moved laterally to

Appl. No. 10/550,850

engage such center-pole lamp configuration, see the discussions at page 2, lines 10-13 and page 4, lines 17-23.

Also, the ends of the two inner tubular portions in Lau do not extend proximate an opposing peripheral side of the outer tubular portion, as is the case with the structure of the present invention. One of the additional benefit of the present invention is that the inner tubular portions are longer than prior art structures thereby increasing or improving the luminous flux. With the prior art, including Lau, the center of the light is obstructed and the ends of the inner tubular portions can only extend partially with the outer tubular portion. See page 1 lines 4-14, pages 1 and 2 under the "Summary of the Invention" and 4, lines 3-6.

In view of the foregoing, Lau does not teach a structure having the extended inner tubes nor a structure having a central passage. As the structure of the reference teaches directly away from the structure of the present invention, it would also not be obvious to modify the structure disclosed in Lau to obtain a structure similar to that of the present invention. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.A. § 102(e)

Appl. No. 10/550,850

The Examiner has rejected claims 1,2 and 4 as being directly anticipated by the reference to Reich et al, US Patent 6,726,496. As with the reference to Lau, Reich et al also teaches a structure that falls within the scope and operability of the prior art. Reich et al uses a central lamp support 45 that blocks and obstructs the central portion of the outer tubular portion of the light. In addition, the ends of the inner tubular portions terminate at the central lamp support and thus do not extend to proximate the opposing peripheral side of the outer tubular portion, as is the case with the present invention and as is set forth in the amended claims.

For the reasons set forth above and with further respect to the differences set forth concerning the reference to Lau which are also applicable to the reference to Reich et al, withdrawal of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested and favorable consideration and allowance of the claims solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response, the amendments submitted herewith, or the allowability of the claims over the prior art, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number provided below for purposes of facilitating prosecution of this

Appl. No. 10/550,850

application and for scheduling a personal interview, if  
necessary.

Respectfully Submitted,

DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.

By 

Ralph A. Dowell, Reg. No. 26,868

Date: July 19, 2006

DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.

Suite 406, 2111 Eisenhower Ave.

Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone - 703 415-2555

Facsimile - 703 415-2559

E-mail - [dowell@dowellpc.com](mailto:dowell@dowellpc.com)

Appl. No. 10/550,850

**In the Drawings**

Amended drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are being submitted on the Replacement Sheets attached hereto. No new matter is being submitted.